Ex. 12

Redacted Version of Document Sought to be Sealed

1	Kathleen Sullivan (SBN 242261)	Steven Cherny (admitted pro hac vice)		
2	kathleensullivan@quinnemanuel.com QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &	steven.cherny@kirkland.com KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP		
	SULLIVAN LLP	601 Lexington Avenue		
3	51 Madison Avenue, 22 nd Floor	New York, New York 10022		
4	New York, NY 10010 Telephone: (212) 849-7000	Telephone: (212) 446-4800 Facsimile: (212) 446-4900		
7	Facsimile: (212) 849-7100	1 acsimic. (212) 440-4700		
5		Adam R. Alper (SBN 196834)		
6	Sean S. Pak (SBN 219032) seanpak@quinnemanuel.com	adam.alper@kirkland.com KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP		
0	John M. Neukom (SBN 275887)	555 California Street		
7	johnneukom@quinnemanuel.com.	San Francisco, California 94104		
8	QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP	Telephone: (415) 439-1400 Facsimile: (415) 439-1500		
8	50 California Street, 22 nd Floor	1 acsimile. (413) 439-1300		
9	San Francisco, CA 94111	Michael W. De Vries (SBN 211001)		
10	Telephone: (415) 875-6600 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700	michael.devries@kirkland.com KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP		
10	17acsmme. (413) 873-0700	333 South Hope Street		
11	Mark Tung (SBN 245782)	Los Angeles, California 90071		
12	marktung@quinnemanuel.com QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &	Telephone: (213) 680-8400 Facsimile: (213) 680-8500		
12	SULLIVAN LLP	1 aesimic. (213) 000-0300		
13	555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5 th Floor			
14	Redwood Shores, CA 94065 Telephone: (650) 801-5000			
17	Facsimile: (650) 801-5000			
15				
16	Attorneys for Plaintiff Cisco Systems, Inc.			
17	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
18	NORTHERN DISTR	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
19	CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.,	CASE NO. 5:14-cv-05344-BLF		
20	Plaintiff,)			
21	v.)	PLAINTIFF CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.'S CORRECTED AND SUPPLEMENTAL		
)	OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO		
22	ARISTA NETWORKS, INC.,	DEFENDANT ARISTA NETWORKS, INC.'S INTERROGATORY NO. 20		
23	Defendant.)	ive. 5 iviEnnogrifori ivo. 20		
24)			
24	,			
25	CONTENTS WAS AN OWNER.	NIETA I AERODDINING DAVIDO ONI VI		
26		NTIAL ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY T TO PROTECTIVE ORDER		
	I I OMMITTON SOBILE	2 10 INOIDOITED ONDER		
27				
28				
	1			

Pursuant to Rules 26 and 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff Cisco Systems, Inc. ("Cisco"), by counsel, hereby provides its corrected and supplemental objections and responses to Defendant Arista Networks, Inc.'s ("Arista's") Interrogatory No. 20.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

Cisco makes the following general objections to Arista's Interrogatories, which apply to each interrogatory regardless of whether the general objections are specifically incorporated into the specific objections and responses below.

- 1. Cisco is responding to each interrogatory as it interprets and understands each interrogatory with respect to the issues in this Litigation. If Arista asserts a different interpretation of any interrogatory, Cisco reserves the right to supplement or amend its responses or objections.
- 2. Cisco objects to each interrogatory to the extent it is inconsistent with or seeks to impose obligations beyond those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Civil and Patent Local Rules of the Northern District of California, and any orders governing this Litigation.
- 3. Cisco objects to the definitions of "Cisco," "You," and "Your," to the extent that the definitions are overly broad and purport to require Cisco to provide information that is not within the possession, custody, or control of Cisco.
- 4. Cisco objects to the definition of "Device" as vague and ambiguous and overly broad, unduly burdensome, and further to the extent that interrogatories using such terms are not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
- 5. Cisco objects to the "Definitions" and "Instructions" of the Interrogatories to the extent they alter the plain meaning of any specific interrogatory and render the interrogatory vague, ambiguous, and overbroad.
- 6. Cisco objects to each interrogatory to the extent that it is unlimited in temporal and/or geographic scope, or to the extent it would require Cisco to provide information or documents in violation of an applicable foreign law or regulation.
- 7. Cisco objects to each interrogatory to the extent that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome, and/or calls for provision of information or documents that are neither relevant to

any claim or defense in this litigation nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

- 8. Cisco objects to each interrogatory to the extent that it calls for production of information or documents that are not within the possession, custody, or control of Cisco, or to the extent the interrogatory seeks information that may not be disclosed pursuant to a protective order or non-disclosure agreement, or calls for Cisco to prepare documents and/or things that do not already exist.
- 9. Cisco objects to each interrogatory to the extent that it calls for production of information or documents that are publicly available or equally available to Arista, and therefore are of no greater burden for Arista to obtain than for Cisco to obtain.
- 10. Cisco objects to each interrogatory as overbroad and unduly burdensome to the extent that it is not limited to a time frame relevant to this Litigation or seeks information or documents not within the applicable scope of this Litigation.
- 11. Cisco objects to each interrogatory to the extent it seeks information or documents that Cisco is not permitted to disclose pursuant to confidentiality obligations to third parties or court order. Cisco will provide such responsive, relevant, and non-privileged information and/or produce documents in accordance with the Protective Order governing this Litigation and after complying with its obligations to the third party and/or court.
- 12. Cisco objects to each interrogatory to the extent it seeks information, documents, and/or things protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, common-interest privilege, and/or any other applicable privilege, immunity, doctrine, or protection, including without limitation in connection with the common interest doctrine (collectively, as used herein, "privileged"). Nothing contained in these objections and responses should be considered a waiver of any attorney-client privilege, work-product protection, or any other applicable privilege or doctrine, including in connection with the common interest doctrine. Cisco does not intend to provide information or produce documents that would divulge any privileged information. Any such disclosure is inadvertent and shall not be deemed a waiver of any applicable privilege or immunity.

- 13. Cisco objects to Arista's Interrogatories to the extent that their subparts exceed the number of interrogatories permitted under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, including Rule 33(a)(1), the Civil and Patent Local Rules of the Northern District of California, and any orders governing this Litigation.
- 14. Cisco objects to each interrogatory to the extent that it is vague, ambiguous, or confusing due to Arista's failure to define terms or failure to describe the information or documents sought with reasonable particularity.
- 15. Cisco objects to the factual characterizations of Arista's Interrogatories. By responding, Cisco does not accept or admit any of Arista's factual characterizations.
- 16. Terms or phrases with specific legal significance appear in many of Arista's Interrogatories. Neither Cisco's objections and responses, nor the provision of information or production of documents in response to any interrogatory, are an admission or indication that such information and documents are relevant to any legal theory, or that any of the legal terms used have any applicability in their legal sense to any information or documents produced by Cisco in response to the Interrogatories.
- 17. Cisco objects to these Interrogatories on relevance and burden grounds to the extent they are not limited in temporal scope, or to the extent that time period specified encompasses time periods not relevant to this Litigation, or to the extent the requests are not limited in geographic scope.
- 18. Cisco objects to the Interrogatories as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent they call for the provision of information or production of documents of technical information, or otherwise, including source code, in connection with Cisco's products, where such information or documents are either duplicative of other documents or information that will be produced and/or are not relevant to this Litigation and Cisco's products relevant to this Litigation. Cisco further objects to the Interrogatories to the extent that they call for the provision of information or production of documents of technical information, or otherwise, including source code, in connection with Cisco's products, where such information and documents are not

necessary to understand the relevant structure, function, and operation of Cisco's products relevant to this Litigation.

- 19. Cisco objects to each interrogatory as premature to the extent it calls for documents or information that is the subject of later disclosure deadlines in this Litigation and/or expert reports and testimony, including as set forth in Rule 26(a)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Patent Local Rules of the Northern District of California, and the Case Management Order entered in this Litigation.
- 20. Any Cisco response that it will provide information or produce documents should not be construed to mean that responsive information or documents in fact exist; only that, if such relevant, non-privileged, non-objectionable information or documents exist, are in Cisco's possession, custody, or control, and are located after a reasonable search of the location or locations where responsive information or documents are likely to be located, such information or documents will be produced in a timely manner.
- 21. Cisco further reserves all rights to supplement its responses to Arista's Interrogatories in compliance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, including under Rule 26(e), as well as the Civil and Patent Local Rules of the Northern District of California and any orders governing this Litigation, and as Cisco's investigation and discovery proceeds in this Litigation.

RESPONSES TO INTERROGATORIES

INTERROGATORY NO. 20:

For each Arista DEVICE in your possession, describe CISCO'S acquisition and use of the DEVICE, including but not limited to from whom CISCO acquired the DEVICE, when CISCO acquired the DEVICE, the reasons or purposes for CISCO acquiring the DEVICE, who has access to the DEVICE, the feature or features of the DEVICE that CISCO has accessed, and each version of EOS that has run on the DEVICE.

1	CORRECTED RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 20:
2	CONTAINS HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY INFORMATION
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
2526	
26 27	
28	
۵ ـ	
	O N

Case 5:14-cv-05344-BLF Document 304-11 Filed 06/13/16 Page 8 of 12

1	
2	
3	CONTAINS HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY INFORMATION
4	
5	SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 20:
6	CONTAINS HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY INFORMATION
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	CONTAINS HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY INFORMATION
26	
27	DATED: May 27, 2016 Respectfully submitted,
28	
	7 CASE NO. 5:14 GV 05244 DI E

CISCO'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO ARISTA'S INTERROGATORY NO. 20

1	/s/ Sean S. Pak
2	Kathleen Sullivan (SBN 242261) kathleensullivan@quinnemanuel.com
3	QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP
4	51 Madison Avenue, 22 nd Floor New York, NY 10010
5 6	Telephone: (212) 849-7000 Facsimile: (212) 849-7100
7	Sean S. Pak (SBN 219032) seanpak@quinnemanuel.com
8	John M. Neukom (SBN 275887) johnneukom@quinnemanuel.com.
9	QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP
10	50 California Street, 22 nd Floor San Francisco, CA 94111
11	Telephone: (415) 875-6600 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700
12	Mark Tung (SBN 245782) marktung@quinnemanuel.com
13	QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP
14	555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5 th Floor Redwood Shores, CA 94065
15	Telephone: (650) 801-5000 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100
16	Steven Cherny (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>)
17	steven.cherny@kirkland.com KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
18	601 Lexington Avenue New York, New York 10022
19	Telephone: (212) 446-4800 Facsimile: (212) 446-4900
20	Adam R. Alper (SBN 196834)
21	adam.alper@kirkland.com KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
22	555 California Street San Francisco, California 94104 Talanhana (415) 420 1400
23 24	Telephone: (415) 439-1400 Facsimile: (415) 439-1500
25	Michael W. De Vries (SBN 211001) michael.devries@kirkland.com
26	KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP 333 South Hope Street
27	Los Angeles, California 90071 Telephone: (213) 680-8400
28	Facsimile: (213) 680-8500

1 PROOF OF SERVICE 2 I hereby certify that, at the date entered below, I caused a true and correct copy of the 3 foregoing to be served by transmission via the email addresses below: 4 Juanita R. Brooks Brian L. Ferrall brooks@fr.com blf@kvn.com 5 Fish & Richardson P.C. Michael S. Kwun 12390 El Camino Real mkwun@kvn.com 6 David J. Silbert San Diego, CA 92130-2081 djs@kvn.com 7 Robert Van Nest Kelly C. Hunsaker 8 hunsaker@fr.com rvannest@kvn.com Fish & Richardson PC arista-kvn@kvn.com 9 500 Arguello Street, Suite 500 Keker & Van Nest LLP Redwood City, CA 94063 633 Battery Street 10 San Francisco, CA 94111-1809 Ruffin B. Cordell 11 Susan Chreighton cordell@fr.com screighton@wsgr.com 12 Lauren A. Degnan Scott Andrew Sher degnan@fr.com ssher@wsgr.com 13 Michael J. McKeon Wilson Sonsini Goodrich Rosati mckeon@fr.com 1700 K Street 14 Washington, DC 20006 Fish & Richardson PC 1425 K Street NW 15 11th Floor Washington, DC 20005 16 17 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on May 18 27, 2016, at San Francisco, California. 19 20 /s/ Catherine R. Lacey Catherine R. Lacey 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28